



Written Testimony on HB5312, An Act Concerning the Recommendations by the Department of Motor Vehicles Regarding Motor Vehicle Statutes

Good morning distinguished members of the Transportation Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with testimony on proposed House Bill 5312 Section 8. My name is Lee Telke and I am the Executive Director of the Towing & Recovery Professionals of Connecticut (TRPC). Tim Vibert has composed this appeal with me, he is the President of TRPC. TRPC is composed of nearly 200 towing professionals who are licensed dealers and repairers. We are composed of small businesses who are trying to improve the quality of life in our state.

We are the industry that brings in the equipment, when there is an accident or disabled vehicle, and complete clearance and recovery operations so the highways may be reopened. To clear a major incident equipment valued at more than two million dollars may be required. We also have to remove and store the damaged vehicles. To conduct this business a substantial parcel of land is required, towing and recovery equipment must be stored and ready to move on a moments notice, buildings for maintenance and storage of vehicles are essential. HB 5312 Section 8 will have a major impact on businesses that have common ownership and business locations across the street from each other. Currently we can place adjacent property, such as this, on the same license. We do have some dealers that are currently in this situation – this change could adversely affect their ability to sell their businesses in the future. It would require adjacent locations to undergo separate licensing, insurances, filings, records and many other items to complicate the business efforts. It is difficult enough to expand onto “adjacent” property, town approvals are necessary and DMV must also check the “new” location. If the property had to be “abutting” property it would make it nearly impossible to expand as your possibilities for expansion of the property would be extremely limited, most business would be forced into relocation (possibly into another town) rather than expansion of the current location, creating a severe restrictive economic condition.

The current wording should remain unchanged, changes would severely limit the future potential of the business, adding another restriction in this regulatory world offers no benefit. If DMV must change the language to “abutting” from “adjacent” there should also be a Statutory provision included (“unless approved by the municipal authority”) to allow for these anomalies in business location licensing when towns approve of it.